

Do not enter
amendment

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Final Office Action dated October 18, 2007. Claims 1-10, 23, and 27-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, and 23 have been amended. New claims 29-32 have been added. No new matter is added by these claims. Claims 22 and 24-26 have been cancelled.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10, 23, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In addition, claims 1-20, 23, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,660,248 ("*Wilson*") in view of Stahl *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,470,843 ("*Stahl*") or in view of Yan *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,830,539 ("*Yan*"), and further in view of Lei *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,777,445 ("*Lei*"). Applicants believe all pending claims are allowable over the art of record and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all claims.

I. Claim 4 complies with the written description requirement

The Examiner has rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that the Specification does not provide support for the limitation "two to eight linking molecules." Applicants submit that the Specification provides support for such a limitation in paragraph [0015], which states "[o]ne preferred method for forming a fullerene-antibiotic conjugate can be generalized as including . . . the synthesis of a fullerene derivative containing *one or more* linkers." (Emphasis added). In addition, paragraph [0047] of the Specification states "up to 8 malonate groups can be placed on C60." Nevertheless, for the sake of expediting allowance of the claims, Applicants have amended claim 4 to recite "more than one linking molecule," which Applicants believe is fully supported by paragraph [0015] of the Specification. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 4 fully complies with the written description requirement and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Claims 1-10, 23, 27 and 28 are definite

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 23, 27, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner states that it is unclear as to what linking molecules would be acceptable because the Specification only provides for malonate or serinol, etc. According to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), the baseline